Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 2B. This sheet replaces the original

sheet for Fig. 2B. In Fig. 2B, "BOOKS FOR NEW USERS has replaced "APPLICATION

DEVELOPMENT" in box 232.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

According to the example in the Specification in lines 7-11, the text in box 232 of amended Fig. 2B should read "BOOKS FOR NEW USERS" instead of "APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT".

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to correct antecedent issues. No claims have been added or cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

I. SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-14, 18, 19, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,111,574 to *Meek* ("*Meek*").

Claims 2-4, 7, 15-17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Meek* in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,738,770 issued to Gorman ("*Gorman*").

II. THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-14, 18, 19, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Meek*.

A. CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites:

A method of depicting a plurality of items and how said plurality of items satisfy
multiple criteria, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:
displaying in a particular order a list of visual indicators, **wherein the particular
order indicates how said plurality of items satisfy a first criteria**;
detecting input indicating the selection of a second criteria;
in response to detecting said input, determining how said plurality of items satisfy the
second criteria; and

while retaining said particular order, displaying a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy the second criteria (emphasis added).

Claim 1 recites a method of depicting a plurality of items and how the plurality of items satisfy multiple criteria. *Meek* is **not related to depicting a plurality of items** and how said plurality of items satisfy multiple criteria. Instead, *Meek* is concerned with teaching a method for **specifying a query** wherein a system allows a user to define various conditions of the query (see Abstract, col. 3, lines 7-24, and col. 3, lines 57-67). Therefore, it will be apparent that *Meek* fails to teach or suggest 1) that a list of visual indicators is in a particular order, 2) that the particular order indicates how a plurality of items satisfy a first criteria, and 3) that the order is retained while a visual indication is displayed of how the plurality of items satisfy the second criteria.

The Office Action alleged that *Meek* discloses the step of displaying in a particular order a list of visual indicators, wherein the particular order indicates how a plurality of items satisfy a first criteria. This is incorrect.

The Office Action cited column 4, line 59 to column 5, line 1 of *Meek* for allegedly disclosing this step. This section corresponds to Figure 3 of *Meek* and describes how a user uses the disclosed system to define a tag, or condition, wherein the condition will be used in a query against an Employee table that supposedly comprises multiple records (e.g. rows) and multiple fields (e.g. columns; see field scroll box 302 of Figure 3). **Nothing in this section refers to an order**, much less how an order indicates how a plurality of items satisfy a first criteria, as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action simply cited the section above (i.e. col. 4, line 59 – col. 5, line 1) for disclosing the first step of Claim 1 and did not equate anything in *Meek* with any feature of the first step. Thus, it is not clear how the above cited section of *Meek* corresponds to the features

taught in the first step. Perhaps the Office Action equated the list of tags of *Meek* (see also Figure 3) with the "list of visual indicators" of Claim 1 and therefore, the list of tags would have to be in a particular order, as required by Claim 1. However, nothing in Figure 3 or the corresponding section describes how the list of tags is in any particular order, especially since the user is the one that creates the tags. Even if it can be assumed that the list of tags is in a particular order, there is nothing that can be equated to a plurality of items, nor to the fact that the particular order indicates how a plurality of items satisfy a first criteria. For example, it does not make sense for the fields in field scroll box 302 to be the plurality of items since the order of the list of tags does not indicate how the fields in field scroll box 302 satisfy a first criteria. Furthermore, nothing in Figure 3 and the accompanying text mentions anything relating to a first criteria, much less how field scroll box 302 could satisfy such a criteria.

Perhaps the Office Action equated the list of tags with the plurality of items. This analogy also fails because, again, nothing could be equated to "a first criteria." There is nothing in *Meek* that suggests how a particular order indicates how the list of tags satisfy a first criteria.

The list of tags most closely relates to the recited "multiple criteria" of Claim 1 because the Office Action analogized the second criteria to a second tag (see Office Action, page 2, paragraph 4), wherein Figure 3 depicts the second tag in the process of being defined (i.e. Supervisor ≠Smith). Based on this understanding that each tag equates to a criteria, nothing in *Meek* could be equated to a list of visual indicators or a plurality of items. It only makes sense to say, in the context of the example provided in the section of *Meek* cited in the Office Action (i.e. col. 5, lines 1-27), that a subset of records from the Employee table of *Meek* satisfies the first tag, or condition. Thus, the records from the Employee table would have to be equated to "said plurality of items." However, the **records from the Employee table are not displayed**, as Claim 1 would require. In fact, *Meek* does not even mention that the records from the

12

Employee table are displayed, **much less displayed in a particular order**. Nor are any records from the Employee table illustrated in any figure. This is because *Meek* is only concerned with disclosing a system for **defining a query and not with** disclosing a method for **depicting results of the query.**

Perhaps the Office Action equated field scroll box 302 of Figure 3 with "said plurality of items." Again, however, there is no indication that the field names of the Employee table that are listed in field scroll box 302 are in any particular order. Also, based on this analogy and the analogy between the second tag of Figure 3 and the second criteria of Claim 1, there is no visual indication of how field scroll box 302 (i.e. the alleged plurality of items) satisfies the second tag/condition (i.e. the alleged second criteria). Such a statement does not make sense since the tag/condition itself is comprised of a field from field scroll box 302.

The Office Action also contended that *Meek* discloses the steps of "in response to detecting said input, determining how said plurality of items satisfy the second criteria; and while retaining said particular order, displaying a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy the second criteria," as recited in Claim 1. This is also incorrect.

In support of its contention, the Office Action only cited Figure 5 of *Meek*, which corresponds to column 5, line 49 to column 6, line 24 of *Meek*. However, *Meek* fails to determine how a plurality of items satisfy a second criteria that is detected, as required by Claim 1. As stated above, the Office Action equated the second criteria to the second tag in the tag list (i.e. Supervisor ≠Smith). Based on that analogy, nothing in the portion of *Meek* cited in the Office Action (nor in the entire *Meek* reference) can be equated with the plurality of items. Even if something in Figure 5 could be equated to a plurality of items, there is **no suggestion that the plurality of items are retained in a particular order**, much less that the plurality of items are retained in the particular order **while a visual indication is displayed** of how said

plurality of items satisfy the second criteria. Again, it is only logical to say that certain records from the Employee table satisfy the second criteria. However, because such records are not displayed, it is impossible to display them in a particular order. It is also impossible to display a visual indication of how "non-displayed" records satisfy a second criteria.

Because *Meek* fails to teach or suggest 1) that a list of visual indicators is displayed in a particular order, 2) that the particular order indicates how the plurality of items satisfy a first criteria, and 3) that a visual indication is displayed of how the plurality of items satisfy a second criteria, Claim 1 is patentable over *Meek*. Reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

B. CLAIM 11

Independent Claim 11 is a method claim that recites the features of Claim 1 that render Claim 1 patentable over *Meek*. For example, Claim 11 states that a list of visual indicators are displayed in a particular order, that the particular order indicates how a plurality of items satisfy a first criteria, and that a visual indication of how the plurality of items satisfy a second criteria is displayed without changing the particular order. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 11 is also allowable over *Meek*.

C. CLAIMS 14 AND 24

Independent Claims 14 and 24 are computer-readable medium claims that recite the features of Claims 1 and 11 that render Claims 1 and 11 patentable over *Meek*. Thus, each of Claims 14 and 24 is patentable over *Meek* for the same reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 11.

D. REMAINING CLAIMS

Claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-23, and 25-26 are dependent claims, each of which depends (directly or indirectly) on the claims discussed above. Each of Claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-23, and

14

25-26 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for the claim on which it depends. In addition, each of Claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-23, and 25-26 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time. The Applicant reserves the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Daniel D. Ledesma
Reg. No. 57,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
(408) 414-1080
Date: April 13, 2005
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _April 13, 2006_ by _Trudy Bagdon_

Trudy Bagdon

3/6

YOU CAN CHOOSE A CATEGORY TO HIGHLIGHT (WITH A ☆ ICON) THE RELEVANT
BOOKS IN THE FOLLOWING LIST: (APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT) ▽

BOX 232 —— —— 212 —— 230

	ADMINISTRATORS GUIDE
	ADVANCED SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR'S GUIDE
	APPLICATION DEVELOPER'S GUIDE-ADVANCED QUEUING
☆	APPLICATION DEVELOPER'S GUIDE-FUNDAMENTALS
	APPLICATION DEVELOPER'S GUIDE-LARGE OBJECTS (LOBs)
	APPLICATION DEVELOPER'S GUIDE-OBJECT-RELATIONAL FEATURES
☆	APPLICATION SERVER OVERVIEW GUIDE-XML
	APPLICATION SEVER WIRELESS EDITION CONFIGURATION GUIDE
	APPLICATION SERVER WIRELESS EDITION DEVELOPER'S GUIDE
	APPLICATION SERVER WIRELESS EDITION IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE
	APPLICATIONS INTERCONNECT USER'S GUIDE
	BACKUP AND RECOVERY GUIDE
	BUILDING REPORTS
☆	CONCEPTS
	CORBA DEVELOPER'S GUIDE AND REFERENCE

214

ICONS —
222

PAGE IMAGE
216

FIG. 2B